

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the drawings submitted with the application on June 27, 2003 be acknowledged as formal.

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 22, and 23 are the independent claims. In an Official Action dated Nov. 14, 2006, claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Claims 1-23 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Independent claims 1, 13, 22, and 23 are amended to overcome the various references, as will be appreciated and as explained below. Having overcome all outstanding rejections in this and previous Official Actions, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the application.

Rejection of Claims 1-23 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Ulrich. However, Ulrich discloses a Distributed File Storage System (DFSS) that “allows the integration of multiple **servers** so that the aggregation of **servers** appears to a client as a single storage device.” Ulrich 0112, emphasis added. Thus, while Ulrich adds *entire servers* to increase capacity, Applicants invention adds an adaptable cache *inside a server* to improve the performance of thereof.

This is a significant difference between Ulrich and Applicants’ claims. Applicants believe this aspect of the claims was previously inherent. For example, the preamble of claim 1 states “A method for reducing bus traversal *in a media server*...” Applicants have nonetheless amended the various claims to clearly emphasize this aspect and thereby unquestionably define over Ulrich. Applicants have chosen this approach understanding that the outstanding Official Action is a final rejection and desiring allowance of the application without further delay.

Furthermore, the claims are amended to explicitly state that the adaptable cache is hot-swappably connected to an input-output bus. While Ulrich provides an entire server that is allegedly hot-swappable, it is readily apparent from Ulrich’s Fig. 42 that the data engine component 4210 is not independently hot-swappable – it is not hot swappably connected to the bus 4201 or bus 4202.

DOCKET NO.: IVBU-0126
Application No.: 10/609,433
Office Action Dated: November 14, 2006

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

Rejection of Claims 1-23 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Yoshida in view of Olarig. Claims 1-23 define over Yoshida for the same reason they define over Ulrich. Applicants' claims teach providing an adaptable cache *inside a server* to improve the performance of thereof, while Yoshida, like Ulrich, and in contrast with Applicants' claims, discloses adding an *entire server* – the cache server of Yoshida's Fig. 2-9.

Conclusion

Applicants note that this application has undergone thorough examination at this point and believe the present amendments readily define over the outstanding references. Therefore we respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application at the Examiners earliest convenience.

Date: January 11, 2007

/Nathaniel Ari Long/
Nathaniel Ari Long
Registration No. 53,233

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439